



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Der Senat unter Augustus. Von T. A. ABELE. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1907. Pp. viii+78. M. 2.40.

This study owes its inception to an address made by Eduard Meyer before a meeting of historians at Heidelberg in 1903, in which the thesis was maintained that Augustus attempted to establish an actual dyarchy in which the senate, as the representative of the old republic and the depository of its powers, was to have an equal position with the *princeps*, who was to be only the first citizen. Meyer's address at the time called forth vigorous opposition. Abele has undertaken to collect and examine the data bearing on the relations of the senate and Augustus to secure if possible a settlement of the question raised by Meyer's address. The greater part of Abele's brochure is taken up with a chronological list of senatorial acts extending from 36 B.C. to 14 A.D. Unfortunately this collection is not complete: all acts relating to religion and all honorary decrees are omitted, in spite of the fact that it is impossible to get a satisfactory conception of the position and competence of the senate without considering all its acts. It is hard to understand why Abele should have chosen the chronological arrangement, which puts difficulties in the way of the reader who is not already familiar with the material; if the acts had been properly grouped according to subject and purpose, it would have been easy to show what changes were introduced with the lapse of time. As it is, the reader must make such grouping for himself with no aid from Abele.

The results of the investigation are given briefly in the second part of the work (pp. 66-78). It appears that from the battle of Actium to the death of Augustus the power of the senate was steadily diminished, while Augustus gradually took to himself all the essential powers of the republican magistrates. Abele could have to advantage thrown more weight than he has done (pp. 67ff.) on the enormous power which the *princeps* had over the senate by virtue of the *electio senatus*; and he should have emphasized the inevitable effect on the position of the senate produced by the equal power which the edicts of the emperor had with the senatorial acts.

There is unfortunately no index.

CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Commentationes Aenipontanae. Quas edunt E. KALINKA et A. ZINGERLE. I. De Clausulis Minucianis. A. Ausserer ad Aenipontem. 1906. Pp. 96.

The subject of metrical clausulae is decidedly in the air and it is apparently difficult for the student of any classical author to escape the

contagion. In the case of Minucius Felix, however, the peculiar position of his *Octavius* in the transition from pagan to Christian Latin and its surprising dependence upon its chief source, the *De natura deorum* of Cicero, sufficiently explain the importance and the interest of such an investigation as that here presented. Ausserer finds his starting-point in the four forms which Zielinski in the well-known study *Das Klauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden* has shown to be the favorite clausulae of Cicero. To the first three of these belong approximately 95 per cent of the 679 clausulae of the *Octavius*, while the fourth is but slightly represented and a few other metrical combinations of a rather bewildering variety are also discovered.

Probably the greatest interest of this investigation is to be found in the possible light thrown upon the dark places of the readings of the one poor manuscript in which the *Octavius* has been preserved. Some seventy passages are discussed by Ausserer from this point of view, and it is noteworthy that in several instances (e.g., *labiis pressit*, chap. ii) the reading of P is preferred on metrical grounds in opposition to the emendations accepted by modern editors.

The text of Boenig has been followed in the main, while for the convenience of the reader, references are also given to the edition of Halm in the Vienna Corpus.

EDWARD A. BECHTEL

TULANE UNIVERSITY

Plato, Apology of Socrates and Crito, with Extracts from the Phaedo and Symposium and from Xenophon's Memorabilia.

Edited by LOUIS DYER, revised by THOMAS DAY SEYMOUR.

With a Vocabulary. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1908. Pp. 246.

This is a revision of the Cron-Dyer *Apology and Crito*, to which Professor Seymour has added other passages with commentary, a vocabulary, and indices. The notes have been simplified and better adapted to the needs of the American schoolboy.

The critical notes are limited to a list of the changes from Dyer's text and another list showing the deviations from the texts of notable German editions, viz., the Cron-Uhle ed. of the *Apology and Crito*, Wohlrab's *Phaedo*, Hug's *Symposium*, and the Breitenbach-Mücke ed. of the *Memorabilia*. One readily accepts the changes from Dyer's text, except the bracketing of *πάλαι Apol. 31d* which removes an effective repetition; less readily, some of the deviations from the texts of the German editors. The following readings, adopted by Seymour, are open to criticism: *Apol. 22a*, *ἴνα μοι*. The conjecture of Stephanus *ἴνα μή μοι* is now confirmed by Δ and the Armenian version. Socrates' assumed "attitude of opposition," shown in his effort to refute the oracle (*ὥς . . . ἐλέγξων 21c*), is kept up consistently in this and succeeding passages (cf.